

*Patent Application No. 09/675,825*  
*Docket No. NU-98-5-1*

**Remarks**

**Introduction**

***Status of claims***

Claims 1 through 20 are pending and have been rejected.

Claims 1, 13 and 16 have been amended. Support for amended Claim 1 can be found at page 8, lines 12 through 16 of the specification. Claim 13 has been amended to correct its dependancy. Claim 16 has been amended to refer to the proper antecedent term.

**The Office Action**

Claims 1 through 20 have been examined on the merits.

***Rejection under 35 USC § 103***

Claims 1 through 20 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell and Wiedmann et al. in view of the combinations of Yotka et al. and Nakel et al. It is the Examiner's position that the claimed composition is rendered obvious by a combination of the above references. It is noted that the fact that the oligosaccharide has a different function in Applicant's invention as opposed to its function in the prior art compositions is irrelevant to the patentability of the composition.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner in that a new function of an ingredient in a composition cannot

*Patent Application No. 09/675,825*  
*Docket No. NU-98-5-1*

be the basis for patentability of the composition. Yet, the presently claimed composition is novel over the cited prior art and the different (new) function of one of the ingredients indicates unobviousness.

None of the cited references discloses an acidified beverage comprising water, an edible acid component, at least one high intensity peptide sweetener and a water-soluble oligosaccharide which is selected from the group consisting of inulins, oligofructose and fructans, wherein the weight ratio of oligosaccharide to high intensity sweetener is 500:1 to 5,000:1.

Mitchell and Yotka et al. suggest to stabilize acid and heat sensitive aspartame by adding inuline.

While Yotka et al. at best disclose oligosaccharide to high intensity sweetener ratios of 300:1 (see Yotka et al., e.g. Example 8 [30.0 % raftilose, 0.1 % aspartame]), Mitchell only discloses a weight ratio of about 0.04:1 (see Mitchell at col.4, lns. 18-30 in view of col. 5, lns. 30-40 and Example 4 [40.81 g aspartame and 1.5 g chicory powder correspond to a ratio of about 1:27 which corresponds to a weight ratio of oligosaccharide to high intensity sweetener of about 0.04:1]). Both references are far away from the presently claimed ratio of 500:1 to 5,000:1. None of these references nor any of the secondary references provide any motivation for increasing the weight ratio of oligosaccharide to high intensity sweetener to 500:1 to 5,000:1. The object of these references was to stabilize aspartame against decomposition at high temperatures (Yotka et al.) and low pH (Mitchell). This is obviously achieved at the (low) ratios disclosed in these references.

The object of the present invention, however, was to compensate for the fading sweetness of a peptide sweetener in a beverage. To achieve this, a balanced amount of oligosaccharide has to be added to the peptide sweetener, such that the weight ratio of oligosaccharide to high intensity sweetener is from 500:1 to 5,000:1. Lower amounts, such as those taught in Yotka et al. and Mitchell would not have solved the above problem. As neither Yotka et al. nor Mitchell have

*Patent Application No. 09/675,825*  
*Docket No. NU-98-5-1*

recognized the problem of fading sweetness in a beverage nor the potential of oligosaccharides to compensate for this loss through their own decomposition products, they are even less able to suggest to increase the amount of oligosaccharide, and, therefore, must fail as reference applied under 35 U.S.C § 103(a). Neither Wiedmann nor Nakel et al. can compensate for this deficiency.

In view of the foregoing amendments and comments, Applicant respectfully requests an early Notice of Allowance in the instant application.

Should Examiner Keith D. Hendricks have any questions regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted



.....  
Klaus Schweitzer  
see attached limited recognition

ProPat, LLC  
2912 Crosby Road  
Charlotte, NC 28211  
Phone (704) 365-4881  
Fax (704) 365-4851


**BEFORE THE OFFICE OF ENROLLMENT AND DISCIPLINE  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**LIMITED RECOGNITION UNDER 37 CFR § 10.9(b)**

Klaus Schweitzer is hereby given limited recognition under 37 CFR § 10.9(b) as an employee of ProPat, L.L.C. to prepare and prosecute U.S. patent applications wherein the applicant is the client of ProPat, L.L.C., and the attorney of record in the applications is Mr. Gregory Clements (Reg. No. 30,713). This limited recognition shall expire on the date appearing below, or when whichever of the following events first occurs prior to the date appearing below: (i) Klaus Schweitzer ceases to lawfully reside in the United States, (ii) Klaus Schweitzer's employment with ProPat, L.L.C. ceases or is terminated, or (iii) Klaus Schweitzer ceases to remain or reside in the United States on an E2 visa.

This document constitutes proof of such recognition. The original of this document is on file in the Office of Enrollment and Discipline of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

**Expires: November 13, 2003**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Harry I. Moatz  
Director of Enrollment and Discipline

FAX RECEIVED  
AUG 05 2003  
GROUP 1700